OUTCOMES OF DEFINE GATEWAY ASSESSMENT

As part of "Stage 1 – Define" of the CAP1616 airspace change process, the UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) has completed a Define Gateway Assessment of Gravitilab Aerospace airspace change proposal (ACP). Based on the outcomes of the January Gateway Meeting held at the CAA on Friday 28th, Gravitilab Aerospace had to take the following post gateway action (to be resolved with a deadline of midday Friday 04/02/2022): "Review the wording of the DPs as many of them are worded and prioritised in such a way that they may limit the Design Principles Evaluation in Stage 2". Other observations and considerations have been provided by the CAA but they won't affect the gateway decision:

- The Define Gateway Submission document and Appendix 2 (Principal List and Engagement) do not provide a clear audit trail in terms of the rationale behind the development of each of the Proposed Design Principles. Whilst Appendix 4 (Principal Stakeholder Responses) provides related evidence, it is left to the reader to determine how the feedback has been used to support the development of the Proposed Design Principles.

- There is a discrepancy in terms of the number of stakeholders that responded to the 'Design Principle Justification Questionnaire'. The Define Gateway Submission document lists a total of 12 'responsive stakeholders' whilst Appendix 7 (Comprehensive Stakeholder Responses) suggests that a total of 18 stakeholders responded. The change sponsor states that only three organisations (NATS, MoD DAATM and Trinity House) provided "highly detailed answers to the Design Justification Questionnaire". Whilst the change sponsor acknowledges that other stakeholders (MCA, HSE and Equinor) received the questionnaire, they state that they did not provide "official responses" to it. Without a more comprehensive summary of the responses from the other stakeholders (e.g. Natural England, Norfolk Wildlife Trust) and/or the related evidence, it has not been possible to determine whether their feedback could have influenced the evolution of the Design Principles.

- The Define Gateway Submission document does not include a chronology of engagement activity detailing key dates confirming feedback windows for each of the questionnaires, Teams meetings etc. It would be useful to see a timeline detailing all the engagement activities undertaken in support of the development of the Design Principles.

- Whilst most of the engagement appears to have been conducted through electronic correspondence (emails and questionnaires), the change sponsor does reference Teams meetings with some stakeholders. No related evidence has been provided within this submission and therefore it has not been possible to determine whether the output from these meetings could have influenced the development of the Design Principles.

POST-GATEWAY ACTIONS

This document presents the actions taken by Gravitilab following the Define Gateway Assessment meeting:

- A chronology of engagement has been added to the main report
- A new section "modified design principles" has been added to the main report
- Section 2.3 "proposed design principles" of the main report has been edited to reflect the elements that led to the list of proposed DPs

- Appendix 5 has been edited and is now entitled "Appendix 5 - Comprehensive List & Engagement - Version 3". The following modifications have been done:
  - Corrected typos
  - Added an introductory paragraph to describ the document
  - Added a new legend
  - Deleted column 5 "response"
  - Added a column "actions taken"
- Appendix 7 has been edited and is now entitled "Comprehensive Stakeholders Responses - Version 2". The following modifications have been done:
  - Added an introductory paragraph to describe the document
- Appendix 2 has been edited and is now entitled "Appendix 2 - Principal List & Engagement - Version 3". The following modifications have been done:
  - Added an introductory paragraph to describ the document
- Section 4 "Responsive Stakeholder List" of the main report has been modified